



## FURTHER INFORMATION CONTINUED FROM PCT/ISA/ 203

Claims 1, 11, 22, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 45, 56, 63, 64, 65 and 66 have been drafted as separate independent claims.

Several of these independent claims seem to refer to similar apparatus, but vary in actual subject matter by the addition or omission of technical features or the use of different terms. Furthermore, because of shifting combinations of similar technical features between the subsets of claims depending from each independent claim, it is impracticable to clearly separate distinct inventions.

For these reasons, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the matter for which protection is sought. The matter for which protection is sought is also not clearly defined. The claims attempt to define the subject matter in terms of result to be achieved which merely amounts to a statement of the underlying problem.

In view of the large number and also the wording of the claims presently on file, which render it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the matter for which protection is sought, the present application fails to comply with the clarity and conciseness requirements of Article 6 PCT (see also Rule 6.1(a) PCT) to such an extent that a meaningful search is impossible. Consequently, no search report can be established for the present application.

No formal objection under Rule 13 PCT (unity of invention) has been raised at this point because of the above mentioned clarity and conciseness objection. However, it could be that several independent or dependent claims define inventions which are not so linked so as to form a single inventive concept and the attention of the applicant is thus drawn to this point.

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that claims relating to inventions in respect of which no international search report has been established need not be the subject of an international preliminary examination (Rule 66.1(e) PCT). The applicant is advised that the EPO policy when acting as an International Preliminary Examining Authority is normally not to carry out a preliminary examination on matter which has not been searched. This is the case irrespective of whether or not the claims are amended following receipt of the search report or during any Chapter II procedure. If the application proceeds into the regional phase before the EPO, the applicant is reminded that a search may be carried out during examination before the EPO (see EPO Guideline C-VI, 8.5), should the problems which led to the Article 17(2) declaration be overcome.